



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A/b
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,006	02/16/2001	Aaron Schoenfeld	303.259US3	5063

7590 07/17/2002
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402

EXAMINER

PERT, EVAN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2829

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/785,006

Applicant(s)

SCHOENFELD, AARON

Examiner

Evan T. Pert

Art Unit

2829

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 June 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 11-25, 35-43.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:


Applicant's arguments are not persuasive:

The basis of applicant's argument for allowance either misinterprets or mischaracterizes the teachings of the Ormond et al. reference, which clearly depicts "at least two perimeter side surfaces extending between the first planar surface and the second planar surface" of the chip [cover figure].

Contrary to applicant's assertion, the examiner has not relied on hindsight reconstruction to set forth that cut edges of chips are desirably smooth, unchipped, and uncracked in the prior art [see col. 4, lines 57-60]. The edges of certain chip embodiments in Ormond et al. are inherently "polished" since the chip edges are optionally inherently polish-etched "to remove any stresses" [col. 5, lines 52-55]. Notably, applicant's disclosure does not even quantify the degree of roughness that is "smooth" or "polished", and the examiner reasonably interprets the clean cut edges of the dice in Ormond et al. as being equivalent to "polished" or "smooth" edges since a high speed diamond blade cut followed by etch to relieve stresses is inherently a method of creating a super-smooth crystalline edge.

Regarding applicant's proposed amendment to claim 39, the addition of "each of" is a matter of form, not affecting scope of the original claim: the examiner interpreted the original language as requiring all offset edges to be "polished."

Regarding applicant's proposed amendment to claim 41, the addition of "transverse and extending" does not distinguish from the offset side surfaces on the cover figure to Ormond et al. since these offset edges are "transverse" at least in part, and "extend" collectively between the two major surfaces of the chip. The same rejection would be maintained for appeal.



MICHAEL SHERRY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800